



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,557	11/07/2003	Kang Soo Seo	1740-000026/US	8241

30593 7590 12/17/2007
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

FINDLEY, CHRISTOPHER G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/702,557

Applicant(s)

SEO ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher Findley

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner notes that the Applicant has added new claims 16-30 via the amendment filed 10/01/2007.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/01/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the prior art cited for the previous rejection (Kaneshige et al., US 6360055 B1) of the independent claims 1, 12, 13, 14, and 15, does not teach or disclose the added limitations for the above listed independent claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, and a modified rejection, addressing the newly added claims and limitations, is included below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. **Claims 1-3, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kaneshige et al. (US 6360055 B1).**

Re claim 1, Kaneshige discloses a reproducing apparatus that both records video data onto and reproduces video data from a computer readable medium having a data

structure for managing reproduction of at least multiple reproduction path video data recorded on the recording medium (Kaneshige: column 1, line 61, through column 2, line 7), comprising: a data area storing clip files of at least a video data stream, each clip file associated with one of a common reproduction path portion and a particular reproduction path portion of the video data stream (Kaneshige: Figs. 9A and 9B); and a management area storing management information for managing reproduction of the video data stream, the management information including an information File associated with each clip file, each information file providing a map for the associated clip file, each map mapping presentation time information to address information for the associated clip file (Kaneshige: Fig. 28; column 16, line 21, through column 17, line 13).

Re claim 2, Kaneshige discloses that the clip files are interleaved (Kaneshige: Figs. 9A and 9B).

Re claim 3, Kaneshige discloses that the clip files associated with particular reproduction path portions are interleaved between the clip files associated with common reproduction path portions (Kaneshige: Figs. 9A and 9B).

Claim 12 is the corresponding recording method implemented by the apparatus and computer readable medium of claim 1, and, therefore, has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 1 above.

Claim 13 is the corresponding reproducing method implemented by the apparatus and computer readable medium of claim 1, and, therefore, has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 1 above.

Re claim 14, Kaneshige discloses an apparatus for recording a data structure for managing reproduction of at least multiple reproduction path video data on a recording medium, comprising: an optical recording device configured to record data on the recording medium (Kaneshige: Fig. 14, pickup driver 104); an encoder for encoding at least multiple reproduction path video data (Kaneshige: column 4, lines 23-52); and a controller for controlling the optical recording device to record clip files of at least a video data stream output from the encoder in a data area of the recording medium, each clip file associated with one of a common reproduction path portion and a particular reproduction path portion of the video data stream (Kaneshige: column 4, lines 23-52), the controlling for controlling the optical recording device to record management information for managing reproduction of the video data stream in a management area of the recording medium, the management information including an information file associated with each clip file, each information file providing a map for the associated clip file, each map mapping presentation time information to address information for the associated clip file (Kaneshige: Fig. 28; column 16, line 21, through column 17, line 13).

Re claim 15, Kaneshige discloses an apparatus for reproducing a data structure for managing reproduction of at least multiple reproduction path video data recorded on a recording medium, comprising: an optical reproducing device configured to reproduce data recorded on the recording medium (Kaneshige: Fig. 14, pickup driver 104); a controller for controlling the optical reproducing device to reproduce clip files of at least a video data stream from the recording medium, each clip file associated with one of a

common reproduction path portion and a particular reproduction path portion of the video data stream (Kaneshige: Fig. 14, system controller 204), the controller for controlling the optical reproducing device to reproduce management information for managing reproduction of the video data stream from a management area of the recording medium, the management information including an information file associated with each clip file, each information file providing a map for the associated clip file, each map mapping presentation time information to address information for the associated clip file (Kaneshige: Fig. 28; column 16, line 21, through column 17, line 13).

Re claim 16, Kaneshige discloses that only one clip File is associated with each particular portion representing a same time period of the video data stream (Kaneshige: Figs. 3B and 6; column 7, lines 48-57).

Re claim 17, Kaneshige discloses that the video data stream is represented by packets (Kaneshige: Fig. 31); and each map maps presentation time stamps to packet addresses (Kaneshige: Fig. 28; column 17, lines 7-13, the presentation order correlates to entry points).

Claim 18 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 17 above.

Claim 19 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 3 above.

Claim 22 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 3 above.

Claim 25 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 3 above.

Claim 28 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 3 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneshige et al. (US 6360055 B1) in view of Inoshita et al. (US 7024102 B1).**

Re claim 4, Kaneshige discloses a majority of the features of claim 4 as discussed above concerning claims 1 and 2, but does not specifically disclose that the clip files have a size to prevent a reproducing apparatus buffer from under-flowing during reproduction of the clip files. However, Inoshita discloses an image data reproducing apparatus in which image data is reproduced from a computer readable medium, which stores multiple camera angles (Inoshita: Fig. 9) wherein all video objects are the same size (Inoshita: column 10, lines 52-56) and a buffer is managed to prevent either overflow or underflow (Inoshita: column 5, lines 45-54). Since both Kaneshige and Inoshita relate to reproducing image data stored on a disc, where the video objects (or cells) are interleaved from multiple camera angles, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine their teachings in order to reproduce multiple camera angles simultaneously for enhanced viewing (Inoshita:

column 2, lines 27-32). The apparatus of Kaneshige, now implemented in conjunction with the apparatus of Inoshita, has all of the features of claim 4.

Re claim 5, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable to claim 5, and, therefore, claim 5 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Re claim 6, the apparatus of Kaneshige, now implemented in conjunction with the apparatus of Inoshita, discloses that more than one clip file is associated with a same one of a common reproduction path portion and a particular reproduction path portion when the one of the common reproduction path portion and the particular reproduction path portion includes data exceeding a clip file size to prevent the reproducing apparatus buffer from over-flowing during reproduction of the clip files (Inoshita: column 10, lines 52-56, all of the video object blocks are the same size, so when the alternate angle path exceeds the size of one video object block, the path contains more than one video object block), as in the claim.

Re claim 7, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable to claim 7, and, therefore, claim 7 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Re claim 8, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6 are applicable to claim 8, and, therefore, claim 8 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 6 above.

Re claim 9, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable to claim 9, and, therefore, claim 9 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Re claim 10, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5 are applicable to claim 10, and, therefore, claim 10 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 5 above.

Re claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6 are applicable to claim 11, and, therefore, claim 11 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 6 above.

Claim 20 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 5 above.

Claim 21 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Claim 23 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 5 above.

Claim 24 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Claim 26 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 5 above.

Claim 27 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Claim 29 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 5 above.

Claim 30 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a. Information processing apparatus and method, recorded medium, and program

Kato et al. (US 20020150383 A1)

b. Apparatus, method, and recording medium implementing audio gap information for an audio presentation discontinuous period

Okada et al. (US 20020031336 A1)

c. Systems and methods with error resilience in enhancement layer bitstream of scalable video coding

Zhang et al. (US 20020021761 A1)

d. Multiangle block reproduction system

Nakai et al. (US 5999698 A)

e. Multi-scene recording medium and apparatus for reproducing data therefrom

Hirayama et al. (US 5732185 A)

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number:
10/702,557
Art Unit: 2621

Page 10

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Findley whose telephone number is (571) 270-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/702,557
Art Unit: 2621

Page 11

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher Findley/

Marsha D Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600